arXiv:1511.01035v3 [math.CO] 3 Nov 2016

On the Number of Non-zero Elements of Joint Degree Vectors

Éva Czabarka[a], Johannes Rauh[b], Kayvan Sadeghi[c], Taylor Short[d], László Székely[a]

[a] *University of South Carolina, Columbia*
[b] *Leibniz University of Hannover*
[c] *University of Cambridge*
[d] *Grand Valley State University*

Abstract

Joint degree vectors give the number of edges between vertices of degree i and degree j for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1$ in an n-vertex graph. We find lower and upper bounds for the maximum number of nonzero elements in a joint degree vector as a function of n. This provides an upper bound on the number of estimable parameters in the exponential random graph model with bidegree-distribution as its sufficient statistics.

Keywords: degree sequence, joint degree distribution, joint degree vector, joint degree matrix, exponential random graph model

1. Introduction

Degree sequences and *degree distributions* have been subjects of study in graph theory and many other fields in the past decades. In particular, in social network analysis, they have been shown to possess a great expressive power in representing and statistically modeling networks; see, e.g., Newman [11] and Handcock and Morris [9].

Generally in this context, models are in exponential family form [2], and hence known as *exponential random graph models* (ERGMs) [8, 16]. The degree sequences and distributions act as the sufficient statistics of ERGMs, i.e. the only information that the ERGM gathers from an observed network. When the sufficient statistic is the degree sequence of a network, the corresponding ERGM

Email addresses: czabarka@math.sc.edu (Éva Czabarka), rauh@math.uni-hannover.de (Johannes Rauh), k.sadeghi@statslab.cam.ac.uk (Kayvan Sadeghi), shorttay@gvsu.edu (Taylor Short), szekely@math.sc.edu (László Székely)

is known as the *beta model*, properties of which have been extensively studied in the recent literature; see Blitzstein and Diaconis [3], Chatterjee et al. [5], and Rinaldo et al. [13]. Degree distributions have also been used as sufficient statistics; see Sadeghi and Rinaldo [14].

Joint degree distributions are a generalization of degree distributions that deal with higher order induced subgraphs than vertices of the graph. They are usually represented in vector form and have been used as a class of network statistics. The graphs generated from such distributions are called *dK-graphs* in the computer science literature, where d indicates the number of vertices of the concerned subgraphs. The class of dK-graphs was originally proposed by Mahadevan et al. [10], formulated as a means to capture increasingly refined properties of networks in a hierarchical manner based on higher order interactions among vertex degrees (see, e.g., Dimitropoulos et al. [7]).

For the case of $d = 2$, the sufficient statistic of the ERGM is the special case of the joint degree distribution, known as the *bidegree distribution*. This model has been formalized in Sadeghi and Rinaldo [14]. In essence, the bidegree distribution describes the probability that a randomly selected edge of the graph connects vertices of degree k and l.

However, model selection for this model is quite challenging, and the general conditions for the existence of the *maximum likelihood estimation* (MLE) are not known, and seem difficult to obtain. As a sufficient condition, genrally for ERGMs, it is known that when there is only one observation of the network available, one can define *the model polytope* to be the convex hull of all the points in a d-dimensional space that correspond to the sufficient statistics of all graphs with n vertices, where d is the dimension of the sufficient statistics. Then the MLE exists if and only if the observed sufficient statistic lies in the interior of the model polytope [2, 4].

In the case of bidegree distribution as sufficient statistics, Sadeghi and Rinaldo [14] used the above result to show that the MLE never exists, and, more importantly, parameters corresponding to zeros on the bidegree vector of the observed network are the ones that are not estimable. This motivates us to find the maximum possible number of non-zero elements on the bidegree vector of a graph, and consequently the maximum number of estimable parameters with an observed network.

On the other hand, Patrinos and Hakimi [12], Amanatidis et al. [1] and Stanton and Pinar [15] introduced the *joint degree vector* (JDV, sometimes also called *joint degree matrix*), which is a non-normalized version of the bidegree vector, i.e. the elements of the JDV represents the exact count of edges between

pairs of vertices of specified degree. Conditions for a given vector to be the JDV of a graph were provided in Patrinos and Hakimi [12], Stanton and Pinar [15], and Czabarka et al. [6].

Finding the maximum possible number of non-zero elements of a JDV for a fixed number of vertices seems quite challenging. In this paper we shall use the conditions in Czabarka et al. [6], as well as other methods and constructions, in order to come up with reasonable lower and upper bounds for this value.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In the next section, we provide basic graph theoretical as well as statistical definitions and preliminary results needed in this paper. In Section 3, we provide a lower bound for the maximum possible number of non-zero elements of a JDV by constructing a family of graphs that reaches this bound. In Section 4, we use two different approaches to present upper bounds for this desired value.

2. Definitions and preliminary results

In this paper we only consider simple graphs without isolated vertices. Let $G = (V, E)$ be such an n-vertex graph and for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ let V_i be the set of vertices of degree i. The *joint degree vector* (JDV) of G is the vector $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{G}) = (j_{11}(G), j_{12}(G), \ldots, j_{n-1,n-1}(G))$ of length $\binom{n}{2}$ with components defined by $j_{ik} = |\{xy \in E(G) : x \in V_i, y \in V_k\}|$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n-1$. For some vector $\mathbf{m}$, if there exists a graph G with $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{m}$, then $\mathbf{m}$ is called a *graphical JDV*. Note that the degree sequence of a graph is determined by its JDV in that

$$|V_i| = \frac{1}{i}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{i} j_{ki} + \sum_{k=i}^{n-1} j_{ik}\right).$$

The following characterization for a vector $\mathbf{m}$ with integer entries to be a graphical JDV is proved by Patrinos and Hakimi [12], Stanton and Pinar [15], and Czabarka et al. [6]. As it provides simple necesssary and sufficient conditions for a vector to be realized as a graphical JDV, we call the result an Erdös-Gallai type theorem.

Theorem 1. *(Erdős-Gallai type theorem for a JDV) An integer vector* $\mathbf{m} = (m_{11}, m_{12}, \ldots, m_{n-1,n-1})$ *of size* $\binom{n}{2}$ *is a graphical JDV if and only if the following holds:*

(i) for all i: $n_i := \frac{1}{i}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{i} m_{ik} + \sum_{k=i}^{n-1} m_{ik}\right)$ *is an integer,*

(ii) for all i: $m_{ii} \leq \binom{n_i}{2}$,

(iii) for all $i < k$: $m_{ik} \leq n_i n_k$.

Moreover, n_i gives the number of vertices of degree i in the graph G.

3. Lower bound construction

Let H_n denote an n-vertex graph with vertex set $V(H_n) = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ and edge set $E(H_n) = \{v_i v_j : i + j > n \text{ and } i \neq j\}$. This graph, which is known as the *half graph*, has degree sequence $n-1, n-2, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, \ldots, 2, 1$. Since a graph on n vertices cannot contain both vertices with degrees 0 and $n-1$, the half graph attains the maximum number of distinct degrees.

For a graph G, denote by $A(G)$ the number of non-zero elements in the JDV of G. By routine counting, we see that $A(H_n) = \frac{n^2}{4}$ if n is even and $A(H_n) = \frac{n^2-1}{4}$ if n is odd. Hence we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{A(H_n)}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{1}{2},$$

so about half the elements of the JDV of the half graph are non-zero. However, there are constructions which acheive a higher number of non-zero elements in the JDV than the half graph. Consider the graph H_n with $n \geq 7$ odd. If one connects the degree 1 vertex to one of the vertices with degree $(n-1)/2$, the JDV element $j_{1,n-1}$ becomes 0, but the elements $j_{2,(n+1)/2}$ and $j_{(n+1)/2,(n+1)/2}$ become nonzero, so the new graph has one more nonzero elements in its JDV. We found even better such constructions, but all of these only improve $A(H_n)$ by a term that is linear in n.

4. Two upper bounds

In this section, we provide two upper bounds that provide numerically very close upper bounds, but use entirely different methods. Although we tried, we were unable to combine these two proof techniques. We think that it is instructive to show both of them.

4.1. Continuous optimization

The following identity is a simple consequence of Theorem 1 and is due to Sadeghi and Rinaldo [14]:

Proposition 1. *For any graph G,*

$$\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A(G)} \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_1 k_2} j_{k_1 k_2}(G) = n - n_0(G), \tag{1}$$

where $n_0(G)$ is the number of isolated vertices in G.

To see this, by Theorem 1(i) we have

$$\begin{aligned} n - n_0(G) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} n_i(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{i} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{i} j_{ki}(G) + \sum_{k=i}^{n-1} j_{ik}(G) \right) \\ &= \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A(G)} \left(\frac{1}{k_1} + \frac{1}{k_2} \right) j_{k_1k_2}(G) = \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A(G)} \frac{k_1+k_2}{k_1k_2} j_{k_1k_2}(G) \end{aligned}$$

If a graph has more than one isolated vertex, then we can connect the isolated vertices among each other; otherwise we can connect the single isolated vertex a largest degree vertex. Neither of these operations decreases the number of nonzero entries in the JDV. Thus, there are optimal graphs without isolated vertex.

Corollary 1. *For any graph G,*

$$\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A(G)} \frac{k_1+k_2}{k_1k_2} \le \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A(G)} \frac{k_1+k_2}{k_1k_2} j_{k_1k_2}(G) \le n.$$

The original optimization problem can be formulated as follows:

- *Maximize $|A(G)|$ among all graphs G with n vertices.*

Using the corollary, we relax this optimization problem and study the following problem, which we call the *discrete relaxation*:

- *Maximize the cardinality $|A|$ among all subsets $A \subseteq P_n := \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : 1 \le i \le j \le n-1\}$ under the constraint $\sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in A} \frac{k_1+k_2}{k_1k_2} \le n$.*

For any n, the cardinality of a subset that solves the discrete relaxation is an upper bound for the original optimization problem.

The discrete relaxation can be solved on a computer as follows: First, compute all values $(k_1 + k_2)/(k_1k_2)$ on P_n. Second, order the values. Third, start adding them up as long as the sum does not exceed n. Finally, count the number of elements that have been added. let α_n be the cardinality of a solution A of the discrete relaxation divided by $\binom{n}{2}$, the cardinality of P_n. The values of α_n are plotted in Figure 1. As a function of n, the optimum α_n decreases roughly (though not strictly) and reaches values below 0.56 for large n.

The limit for $n \to \infty$ can be computed by approximating the discrete relaxation by the following optimization problem, which we call the *continuous relaxation*:



Figure 1: The solution of the discrete and continuous relaxation. The blue line plots the upper bound on α_n from Lemma 1. The red line is the limit for large n of α_n and α'_n.

- *Maximize* $\frac{\mu(A')}{(n-1)^2}$ *(where* μ *denotes the Lebesque measure) among all subsets* $A' \subseteq [1,n] \times [1,n]$ *that are symmetric to the line* $y = x$ *and satisfy* $\iint_{A'} \frac{1}{x} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y \leq n$.

Let α'_n be the maximum of the continuous relaxation.

Lemma 1. $\alpha_n \leq \frac{n-1}{n}\alpha'_n + \frac{1}{n}$.

Proof. To each $(i,j) \in P_n$ associate the two squares $A_{i,j} := [i, i+1) \times [j, j+1)$ and $A_{j,i} := [j, j+1) \times [i, i+1)$. For $A \subseteq P_n$ let $A'' = \bigcup_{(i,j)\in A} A_{i,j}$ and $A' = A'' \cup \bigcup_{(i,j)\in A} A_{j,i}$. Then

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in A} \frac{i+j}{i \cdot j} \geq \sum_{(i,j)\in A} \iint_{A_{i,j}} \frac{x+y}{x \cdot y} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y = \iint_{A''} \frac{x+y}{x \cdot y} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \iint_{A'} \frac{x+y}{x \cdot y} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y = \iint_{A'} \frac{1}{x} \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y.$$

Here, the first inequality follows from the fact that the maximum of $\frac{x+y}{xy} = \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{y}$ over $A_{i,j}$ is at $(x,y) = (i,j)$. The second inequality follows by not double-counting the set $A_d := \bigcup_{(i,i)\in A} A_{i,i}$ corresponding to the diagonal elements of A. The last equality follows since $\frac{x+y}{x \cdot y} = \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{y}$ and since A' is symmetric about $y = x$. Therefore, if A is feasible for the discrete relaxation, then A' is feasible solution for the continuous relaxation. Now,

$$|A| = \mu(A'') = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(A') + \mu(A_d)) \leq \frac{\mu(A')}{2} + \frac{n-1}{2},$$

and so

$$\alpha_n \leq \frac{(n-1)^2}{2\binom{n}{2}}\alpha'_n + \frac{n-1}{2\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{n-1}{n}\alpha'_n + \frac{1}{n}. \qquad \square$$

Corollary 2. $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \alpha'_n$.

It is not difficult to see that, actually, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha'_n$. Figure 1 shows that the upper bound from Lemma 1 is not very tight.

Next, we want to solve the continuous relaxation. The idea is the following: As the set A' it is advantageous to choose a sublevel set of the function $\frac{x+y}{x\cdot y}$. For $c > 0$ let

$$A_c := \Big\{(x,y) \in [1,n]^2 : \frac{x+y}{x\cdot y} \leq c\Big\}.$$

Let

$$y_c(x) = \frac{1}{c - \frac{1}{x}} = \frac{x}{xc-1}, \qquad x_1(c) = \frac{1}{c-\frac{1}{n}} = \frac{n}{nc-1}.$$

Lemma 2. $A_c = \Big\{(x,y) \in [1,n]^2 : x_1(c) \leq x \leq n,\ y_c(x) \leq y \leq n\Big\}$. *In particular, $A_c \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $nc \geq 2$.*

Proof. If $x < x_1(c)$ and $1 \leq y \leq n$, then $\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{y} > c - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} = c$. If $x_1(c) \leq x \leq n$ and $1 \leq y < y_c(x)$, then $\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{y} > c - \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x} = c$. For the second statement observe that $x_1(c) \leq n$ if and only if $nc \geq 2$. Similarly, $y_c(x) \leq n$ if and only if $x \geq x_1(c)$. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Assume that c is such that $x_1(c) \geq 1$. Then $y_c(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in [1,n]$.*

Proof. $y_c(x)$ decreases monotonically with x. Therefore, $y_c(x) \geq y_c(n) = x_1(c)$ for all $x \in [1,n]$. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let $n \geq 3$. The set A_c is feasible for the continuous relaxation if and only if*

$$(nc-2)\log(nc-1) \leq nc \tag{2}$$

Proof. Assume that c is such that $x_1(c) \geq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{A_c} \frac{1}{x}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y &= \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x \int_{y_c(x)}^{n} \mathrm{d}y \frac{1}{x} = \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x \frac{n - y_c(x)}{x} \\ &= \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x \left(\frac{n}{x} - \frac{1}{xc-1}\right) = n\log\frac{n}{x_1(c)} - \frac{1}{c}\log\frac{nc-1}{cx_1(c)-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$cx_1(c) - 1 = \frac{cn - nc + 1}{nc-1} = \frac{1}{nc-1},$$

and so

$$\iint_{A_c} \frac{1}{x}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y = n\log(nc-1) - \frac{1}{c}\log(nc-1)^2 = (n-\frac{2}{c})\log(nc-1).$$

Hence, A_c is feasible if and only if

$$(nc-2)\log(nc-1) \le nc.$$

Now suppose that $n > e$. If c satisfies (2), then

$$x_1(c) \ge \frac{n}{\exp(nc/(nc-2))} > \frac{n}{e} > 1.$$

Thus, the above calculation is valid and shows that A_c is feasible. On the other hand, if $n > e$ and if c violates (2), then A_c is not feasible. □

To find the solution of the continuous relaxation, we need to find the value of c that solves (2) with equality. Consider the equation

$$\log(\beta-1) = \frac{\beta}{\beta-2}.$$

Both the left and the right hand side change sign at $\beta = 2$. For $\beta > 2$, both sides are positive, and for $\beta < 2$ they are negative. By Lemma 2, we are looking for a solution larger than 2. For $\beta > 2$, the right hand side is decreasing, while the left hand side is increasing. It follows that there is a unique solution $\beta_0 > 2$. Numerically, $\beta_0 \approx 5.68050$. Thus, A_c is feasible if and only if $c \le \beta_0/n$, and in order to maximize $|A_c|$, we have to choose $c = \beta_0/n$.

Lemma 5. *$x_1(\beta_0/n) > 1$ for n large enough.*

Proof. $x_1(\beta_0/n) - 1 = \frac{n-\beta_0+1}{\beta_0-1} > 0$ for n large enough. □

It remains to compute the maximum value of the continuous relaxation. If $x_1(c) \ge 1$, then

$$|A_c| = \iint_A \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y = \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x \int_{y_c(x)}^{n} \mathrm{d}y = \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x(n - y_c(x)).$$

Now,

$$y_c(x) = \frac{1}{c}\left(\frac{x}{x-\frac{1}{c}}\right) = \frac{1}{c}\left(1 + \frac{1/c}{x-\frac{1}{c}}\right) = \frac{1}{c}\left(1 + \frac{1}{cx-1}\right),$$

and so

$$|A_c| = \int_{x_1(c)}^{n} \mathrm{d}x(n - \frac{1}{c} - \frac{1/c}{cx-1}) = (n - \frac{1}{c})(n - x_1(c)) - \frac{1}{c^2}\log\frac{cn-1}{cx_1(c)-1}$$
$$= n^2\frac{nc-1}{nc}\frac{nc-2}{nc-1} - \frac{2}{c^2}\log(nc-1).$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha'_n = \frac{|A_{\beta_0/n}|}{(n-1)^2} = \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^2}\left[\frac{\beta_0-2}{\beta_0} - \frac{2}{\beta_0^2}\frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0-2}\right] = \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^2}\frac{(\beta_0-2)^2-2}{\beta_0(\beta_0-2)}.$$

Numerically, $\alpha'_n \approx n^2/(n-1)^2 0.55225694$.

4.2. Second Bound

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an n-vertex graph and let $A(G)$ be defined as in Section 4.1. Denote by $n_i = |A_i|$ the number of vertices with degree i. We call i a single if $n_i = 1$ and multiple if $n_i \geq 2$, noting that some i are neither single nor multiple, as they just do not occur as degrees. As before, for $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n-1$, let j_{ik} be the number of edges between the ith and kth degree classes and $\chi_{ik} = 1$ if $j_{ik} > 0$, and 0 otherwise. It is easy to see that $|A(G)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\sum_{k=i}^{n-1}\chi_{ik}$. Now we set $D_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i}\chi_{ki} + \sum_{k=i+1}^{n-1}\chi_{ik}$ and $B(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} D_i$. Note that for $k \neq i$, D_i counts $\chi_{ki} = \chi_{ik}$ twice but χ_{ii} is counted only once, so we get $|A(G)| \leq \frac{B(G)+n-1}{2}$ and therefore

$$\frac{|A(G)|}{\binom{n}{2}} \leq \frac{B(G)+n-1}{2}\cdot\frac{2}{n(n-1)} = (1+o(1))\frac{B(G)}{n^2}.$$

We use this to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *For any graph G,*

$$\frac{|A(G)|}{\binom{n}{2}} \leq (1+o(1))\frac{13}{24}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on a sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 6. *Let m be the number of distinct vertex degrees of G. Then,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} D_i \leq \sum_{i:\, i \text{ single}} \min(m,i) + \sqrt{m}\sqrt{\sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} \min(m,i)}\sqrt{\sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} n_i}.$$

Proof. Observe that $D_i \leq m \leq mi$ and $D_i \leq in_i$, and hence

$$D_i \leq \min(m, in_i, mn_i) = \min(m, \min(m,i)\cdot n_i) \leq \sqrt{m\cdot\min(m,i)\cdot n_i}, \quad (3)$$

since the minimum of two elements is less than their average. Note that if i is single we have

$$D_i \leq \min(m, i). \tag{4}$$

Employing (3) and (4) we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} D_i &\leq \sum_{i:\, i \text{ single}} D_i + \sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} D_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i:\, i \text{ single}} \min(m, i) + \sqrt{m} \sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} \sqrt{\min(m, i) \cdot n_i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i:\, i \text{ single}} \min(m, i) + \sqrt{m} \sqrt{\sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} \min(m, i)} \sqrt{\sum_{i:\, i \text{ multiple}} n_i}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz. □

We wish to upper bound the term from (5) over all graphs G. From our lower bound construction we know that $|A(G)| \geq (1 - o(1))\frac{1}{2}n^2$. So we may assume that $m > n/\sqrt{2}$, else we would have $|A(G)| \leq m^2 \leq n^2/2$ and our estimation of $|A(G)|$ would be complete.

Lemma 7. $\displaystyle\sum_{i:n_i>0} \min(m, i) \leq m(n - m - 1) + \frac{n(2m - n + 1)}{2}.$

Proof. We wish to upper bound $\sum_{i:n_i>0} \min(m, i)$ over all graphs. So assume the m highest possible degrees occur in our graph:

$$n - 1, n - 2, \ldots, n - m + 1, n - m.$$

Our assumption $m > n/\sqrt{2}$ implies $m > n - m + 1$, so the value of m has to appear in the list of degrees above. There are $n - 1 - m$ terms strictly larger than m in this list and each contributes $\min(m, i) = m$. The remaining terms sum up exactly $\sum_{i=n-m}^{m} i$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i:n_i>0} \min(m, i) &\leq m(n - m - 1) + \sum_{i=n-m}^{m} i \\ &= m(n - m - 1) + \frac{n(2m - n + 1)}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Now if the m highest degrees do not occur in our graph, then some degree less than $n - m + 1$ must occur which clearly gives something smaller than the term in (6). □

Let s be the number of degrees i that are singles. Observe that $s \leq m$ and $s + 2(m - s) \leq n$, implying that $s \leq m \leq \frac{n+s}{2}$. Using $s + \sum_{i:i \ multiple} n_i = n$

and substituting

$$y = \sum_{i:i \text{ single}} \min(m, i)$$
$$z = \sqrt{\sum_{i:i \text{ multiple}} \min(m, i)},$$

we can write the term in (5) as

$$g(y, z, s, m) = y + \sqrt{m} \cdot z\sqrt{n - s}.$$

We wish to maximize g subject to the constraints

1. All variables are non-negative and $s \leq n$,
2. $s \leq m \leq \frac{n+s}{2}$, and
3. $y + z^2 \leq m(n - m - 1) + \frac{n(2m-n+1)}{2}$,

where constraint 3 follows from Lemma 7.

Note that $g(y, z, s, m) = O(n^2)$, so we wish to determine how large the coefficient of n^2 in g can be as $n \to \infty$. To do this we set $S = s/n$, $M = m/n$, $Y = \sum_{i:i \text{ single}} \min(m, i)/n^2$, and $Z = \sqrt{\sum_{i:i \text{ multiple}} \min(m, i)/n^2}$ and turn to the following numeric optimization problem: maximize

$$f(Y, Z, S, M) = Y + \sqrt{M} \cdot Z\sqrt{1 - S}$$

subject to the constraints

(a) All variables are non-negative and $S \leq 1$,
(b) $S \leq M \leq \frac{1+S}{2}$, and
(c) $Y + Z^2 \leq M(1 - M) + \frac{2M-1}{2}$.

By routine arguments, it follows that $g(y, z, s, m) \leq (1 + o(1))\, f(Y, Z, S, M)n^2$. Also note that (b) implies that $M \leq 1$.

Lemma 8. *If constraints (a), (b), and (c) hold, then*

$$f(Y, Z, S, M) \leq \frac{13}{24}.$$

Proof. For fixed values of S, M and Z, the function f is monotone in Y. Therefore, we have to choose Y as large as possible, which, according to the last constraint, implies that $Y = -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2} - Z^2$. Also the right hand side of constraint (c) is non-negative if and only if $1 - \sqrt{2}/2 \leq M \leq 1 + \sqrt{2}/2$, so $1 - \sqrt{2}/2 \leq M \leq 1$.

For fixed values of Z and M the target function f decreases with S. Hence we need to choose S as small as possible. The constraints imply $S \geq \max\{0, 2M - 1\}$, so we consider the following two cases.

If $M \leq 1/2$, then $S = 0$. In this case, we need to optimize

$$f(Z, M) = -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2} - Z^2 + \sqrt{M} \cdot Z$$

subject to

1. $1 - \sqrt{2}/2 \leq M \leq 1/2$,
2. $Z^2 \leq -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2}$.

The target function f is quadratic in Z with maximum at $Z_0(M) = \sqrt{M}/2$. Observe that

$$f(Z_0(M), M) = -M^2 + \frac{9}{4}M - \frac{1}{2}.$$

This function is quadratic in M, with maximum at $M = \frac{9}{8} > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, it is maximized by the largest feasible $M = 1/2$. In total,

$$f(Z, M) \leq f(Z_0(M), M) \leq f(Z_0(1/2), 1/2) = \frac{3}{8}$$

for all feasible values of (Z, M). Finally, observe that $(Z_0(1/2), 1/2)$ is feasible, since

$$Z_0(1/2)^2 = \frac{1}{8} < \frac{1}{4} = -\frac{1}{4} + 1 - \frac{1}{2}.$$

For the second case, suppose that $M \geq 1/2$. Then $S = 2M - 1$, and we need to optimize

$$f(Z, M) = -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2} - Z^2 + \sqrt{M} \cdot Z \cdot \sqrt{2(1 - M)}$$

subject to

1. $1/2 \leq M \leq 1$,
2. $Z^2 \leq -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2}$.

Again, f is quadratic in Z, with maximum at $Z_0(M) = \sqrt{M(1 - M)/2}$. To see that $(Z_0(M), M)$ is feasible, we have to check that

$$0 \leq -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2} - Z_0(M)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}M^2 + \frac{3}{2}M - \frac{1}{2}.$$

The right hand side is a quadratic polynomial with zeros at $(3 - \sqrt{5})/2 < 1/2$ and $(3 + \sqrt{5})/2 > 1$, which proves that $(M, Z_0(M))$ satisfies all constraints.

Therefore, we need to maximize the quadratic function

$$f(M) = -M^2 + 2M - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}M(1 - M) = -\frac{3}{2}M^2 + \frac{5}{2}M - \frac{1}{2}$$

with $1/2 \leq M \leq 1$. The maximum is at $M = 5/6$, where the value is

$$f(5/6) = -\frac{75}{72} + \frac{25}{12} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{13}{24} = 0.541\overline{6}. \qquad \square$$

Proof (of Theorem 2). By Lemma 6 and Lemma 8,

$$\begin{aligned} B(G) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} D_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i:i \text{ single}} \min(m,i) + \sqrt{m}\sqrt{\sum_{i:i \text{ multiple}} \min(m,i)}\sqrt{\sum_{i:i \text{ multiple}} n_i} \\ &= g(y,z,s,m) \\ &\leq (1+o(1))\, f(Y,Z,S,M)n^2 \\ &\leq (1+o(1))\, \frac{13}{24}n^2, \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$\frac{|A(G)|}{\binom{n}{2}} = (1+o(1))\frac{B(G)}{n^2} \leq (1+o(1))\, \frac{13}{24}. \qquad \square$$

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge that it was Aaron Dutle who first gave a non-trivial upper bound $(1 - 1/e + o(1))n^2 = 0.63212...n^2$ for the number of non-zero entries in a JDV. His proof was somewhat similar to Subsection 4.1 but missed the symmetry that is key to that subsection. All authors except the second author were supported in part by the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The last author was supported in part by the NSF DMS contracts no. 1300547 and 1600811. The authors are also grateful to Sonja Petrović and Despina Stasi for helpful discussions.

References

[1] Amanatidis, Y., Green, B., and Mihail, M. (2011). Graphic realizations of joint-degree matrices. *In preprint.*

[2] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. (1978). *Information and Exponential Families in Statistical Theory.* John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK.

[3] Blitzstein, J. and Diaconis, P. (2010). A sequential importance sampling algorithm for generating random graphs with prescribed degrees. *Internet Math.*, 6(4):489–522.

[4] Brown, L. (1986). *Fundamentals of Statistical Exponential Families*, volume 9. IMS Lecture Notes—Monograph Series, Hayward, CA, USA.

[5] Chatterjee, S., Diaconis, P., and Sly, A. (2011). Random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 21(4):1400–1435.

[6] Czabarka, E., Dutle, A., Erdős, P. L., and Miklós, I. (2015). On realizations of a joint degree matrix. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 181(0):283 – 288.

[7] Dimitropoulos, X., Krioukov, D., Vahdat, A., and Riley, G. (2009). Graph annotations in modeling complex network topologies. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation*, 19(4):17:1–17:29.

[8] Frank, O. (1991). Statistical analysis of change in networks. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 45(3):283–293.

[9] Handcock, M. S. and Morris, M. (2007). A simple model for complex networks with arbitrary degree distribution and clustering. *Statistical Network Analysis: Models, Issues and New Directions*, 4503:103–114.

[10] Mahadevan, P., Krioukov, D., Fall, K., and Vahdat, A. (2006). Systematic Topology Analysis and Generation Using Degree Correlations. *SIGCOMM 2006*, 36(4):135–146.

[11] Newman, M. E. J. (2003). The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review*, 45:167–256.

[12] Patrinos, A. and Hakimi, S. (1976). Relations between graphs and integer-pair sequences. *Discrete Math.*

[13] Rinaldo, A., Petrović, S., and Fienberg, S. E. (2013). Maximum lilkelihood estimation in the beta model. *Annals of Statistics*, 41(3):1085–1110.

[14] Sadeghi, K. and Rinaldo, A. (2014). Statistical models for degree distributions of networks. In *NIPS workshop*, Montreal, Canada.

[15] Stanton, I. and Pinar, A. (2012). Constructing and sampling graphs with a prescribed joint degree distribution. *J. Exp. Algorithmics*, 17:3.5:3.1–3.5:3.25.

[16] Wasserman, S. and Pattison, P. (1996). Logit models and logistic regressions for social networks: I. an introduction to Markov graphs and p^*. *Psychometrika*, 61(3):401–425.